UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,814	09/28/2001	Bruce Alexander	VIGL118030	3066

26389   7590   05/07/2004

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER
GOLINKOFF, JORDAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/966,814	Applicant(s) ALEXANDER ET AL.
	Examiner Jordan S Golinkoff	Art Unit 2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 September 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-40_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-40_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _28 September 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _2_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Page 2, line 17 – "internetwork" should be changed to "internet work"

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2.   Claims 5, 10, 12, and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- Claim 5 – "instructions controls the" should be changed to "instruction control the"

- Claim 10 – "control data includes;" should be changed to "control data includes:"

- Claim 12 – "said remote device" should be changed to "said remote device." at the

    end of the claim.

- Claim 14 – "said video camera" should be changed to "said video camera." at the end

    of the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-16, 19, 23-27, 29-31, 35-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Crater et al ("Crater," US005982362A).

As per independent claim 1, Crater teaches a method for interacting with a remote device

comprising: obtaining a request corresponding to controlling one or more identifiable remote

devices (column 3, lines 58-64); generating a graphical user interface operable to control the

remote device, wherein controlling said device includes accessing said remote device and issuing

instructions (column 3, lines 37-45 and lines 58-64); obtaining user control instructions from said

graphical user interface (column 7, lines 25-36); transmitting remote device control data

corresponding to said user control instructions (column 7, lines 25-36); and obtaining remote

device data generated by said remote device (column 7, lines 25-36).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches that generating a graphical

user interface includes dynamically generating a graphical user interface (column 8, lines 20-25).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches dynamically generating a

graphical user interface includes: identifying a remote device corresponding to said request

(column 8, lines 19-36); selecting a program module corresponding to said identified remote

device from a plurality of program modules, said program module operable to control said

remote device (column 8, lines 19-36); generating a screen interface including said selected

program module, said program module including a graphical user interface component

corresponding to said requested remote device (column 8, lines 25-36).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Crater teaches dynamically generating a

graphical user interface includes: identifying two or more remote devices corresponding to said

request (column 9, lines 54-62, *i.e. – data from many remote devices can be displayed together*);

selecting a program module corresponding to each identified remote device from a plurality of

program modules, said program modules operable to control said remote device (column 9, lines

54-62); generating a single screen interface containing all program modules, said program

modules operable to generate graphical user interface components corresponding to each

requested remote device (column 9, lines 23-26 and lines 54-62).

Claim 30 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Crater teaches that control instructions

control the operation of all of said remote devices (column 2, lines 63-68).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches that the graphical user

interface is a Web page (column 8, lines 19-25).

Claim 31 is similar in scope to claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches obtaining a request

corresponding to controlling one or more identifiable remote devices includes: obtaining a

request for monitoring data corresponding to said remote device (column 8, lines 19-25).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches wherein obtaining a

request corresponding to controlling one or more identifiable remote devices includes: obtaining

a request to transmit data to said remote device (column 7, lines 25-36).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Crater teaches that the transmitted data

causes said remote device to move (column 7, lines 25-36).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches transmitting control data

includes: transmitting a request for accessing data from said remote device (column 10, lines 49-

59); and transmitting authorization for access to said remote device (column 10, lines 49-59).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device includes: obtaining real-time data generated by said remote device (column 3, lines 12-15).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device includes: obtaining pre-recorded data generated by said remote device (column 3, lines 15-23).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches that the remote device is a video camera, and wherein obtaining remote device data includes obtaining video data from said video camera (column 3, lines 12-23).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, Crater teaches that transmitting control data includes transmitting data manipulating said video camera (column 7, lines 25-31).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches that transmitting data includes manipulating operating parameters of said remote device using said graphical user interface (column 9, lines 4-12); and wherein obtaining remote device data includes obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device based on said manipulated operating parameters (column 9, lines 4-12).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Crater teaches that the graphical user interface includes a graphical means for manipulating said operating parameters of said remote device, said graphical means operable to receive user inputs corresponding to said manipulation (column 3, lines 62-65 and column 7, lines 25-31).

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches obtaining user control data includes obtaining a request for manipulating operating parameters of said remote device

(column 3, lines 62-65); and wherein transmitting remote device control data includes translating said request into device specific commands, and transmitting said device specific commands to said remote device operable to change said operating parameters of said remote device (column 7, lines 25-36).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions (column 3, lines 24-35).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches a system having a processor, a memory, and an operating environment (column 3, lines 24-35).

Claims 35-36 are similar in scope to claims 23-24, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 25, Crater teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for dynamically interacting between at least one remote device and a computing device, comprising: a user interface application operable to dynamically generate a graphical user interface corresponding to the remote device (column 8, lines 20-25); a device interface application operable to communicate device data from the remote device (column 7, lines 25-36), and operable to manipulate said data (column 7, lines 25-36); and a data transmittal application operable to transmit said data to the computing device, and to facilitate communication between the remote device and the computing device (column 7, lines 25-36).

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 25, Crater teaches that the computing device is a server computer (column 9, lines 42-47).

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 25, Crater teaches that the computing device is a client computer (column 9, lines 62-66).

As per independent claim 29, Crater teaches a method for dynamically generating a user interface for controlling at least one remote device comprising: obtaining a request to control at least one pre-selected remote device (column 3, lines 58-64); selecting a program module corresponding to said pre-selected remote device from a plurality of program modules, said program module operable to control said remote device (column 7, lines 25-36); transmitting a screen interface with said program module (column 7, lines 25-36); wherein said screen interface containing said program module is operable to generate a graphical user interface when loaded within a browser application (column 9, lines 62-66).

As per independent claim 37, Crater teaches a system for dynamically generating a user interface for controlling at least one remote device comprising: at least one remote device operable to receive control commands and to transmit monitoring data based on said control commands (column 7, lines 25-36); a server computer in communication with said remote device, said server computer operable to dynamically generate a graphical user interface based on said remote device (column 9, lines 42-47); a client computer in communication with said premises server, said client computer operable to display said graphical user interface, and request said control commands (column 9, lines 62-67).

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 37, Crater teaches a proxy server in communication with said client computer and said premises server, said proxy server operable to process and store monitoring data generated by said remote device (column 9, lines 15-20 and column 7, lines 32-36, *i.e. – camera output signals are stored on a network host and transferred to a local server to be displayed on a client system*).

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 37, Crater teaches that the server computer and said client computer are in communication via the Internet (column 7, lines 37-49).

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 37, Crater teaches that the server computer and said client computer are in communication via a dedicated device control network (column 7, lines 37-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Amini et al. ("Amini," US006698021B1).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, the teachings of Crater in regards to claim 16 have been discussed above. Crater teaches that the remote device is a video camera (column 3, lines 12-23). Crater does not disclose a graphical means that is a graphical controller including graphical representation of a compass having an origin and directional indicators.

Amini teaches a graphical means that is a graphical controller including graphical representation of a compass having an origin and directional indicators (figure 10C, element 1032 and column 16, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater with a graphical means to control a video camera using a compass representation, as taught by Amini, with the motivation

to provide an intuitive user interface capable of controlling camera motion relative to any initial

camera position (column 16, lines 1-6)

7.   Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater

et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Amini et al. ("Amini," US006698021B1) in further

view of Brush, II et al. ("Brush," US# 5732232).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, teachings of the combination of Crater

and Amini in regards to claim 16 have been discussed above. The combination of Crater and

Amini do not disclose that the graphical controller is operable to communicate the intensity of

said manipulation, said intensity based on the distance away said user input is from said origin.

Brush teaches that the graphical controller is operable to communicate the intensity of

said manipulation, said intensity based on the distance away said user input is from said origin

(column 3, lines 28-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of Crater and Amini with a

means to indicate the intensity of user input based on the distance the user input is from the

origin, as taught by Brush, with the motivation to more efficiently translate user input into

desired outcomes on a graphical user interface and to enable a greater degree of user control of

the interface (column 4, lines 65-67)

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 18, Crater teaches remote device data

generated by said remote device based on said changed operating parameters is real-time data

(column 3, lines 12-15).

8.   Claims 21, 28, 32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Lemons et al. ("Lemons," US006504479B1).

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 1, the teachings of Crater in regards to claim 1 have been discussed above. Crater does not disclose that the remote device is selected from the group consisting essentially of intrusion detection devices, card readers, door strikes and contacts, access control panels, bar code scanners, video cameras, still cameras, and microphones.

Lemons teaches that the remote device is selected from the group consisting essentially of intrusion detection devices, card readers, door strikes and contacts, access control panels, bar code scanners, video cameras, still cameras, and microphones (column 6, lines 65-68 and column 6, lines 41-57 and column 5-6, lines 47-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater to include intrusion detection devices, card readers, door strikes and contacts, access control panels, bar code scanners, video cameras, still cameras, and microphones, as taught by Lemons, with the motivation to monitor and control all aspects of an integrated security system (column 2, lines 30-33).

Claim 28 is similar in scope to claim 21, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 29, the teachings of Crater in regards to claim 29 have been discussed above. Crater does not explicitly disclose that the pre-selected remote device is a video camera having pan-tilt-zoom functionality, and wherein said graphical user interface is operable to control said pan-tilt-zoom functionality of said video camera and to view data from said video camera.

Lemons teaches that the pre-selected remote device is a video camera having pan-tilt-zoom functionality, and wherein said graphical user interface is operable to control said pan-tilt-

zoom functionality of said video camera and to view data from said video camera (column 5, lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater with a means to control the pan-tilt-zoom functionality of a video camera and view data from the video camera, as taught by Lemons, with the motivation to control the function of remote video camera (column 3, lines 9-11).

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 29, the teachings of Crater in regards to claim 29 have been discussed above. Crater does not disclose that the pre-selected remote device is a motion detector.

Lemons teaches that the pre-selected remote device is a motion detector (column 7, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater to include intrusion detection devices, card readers, door strikes and contacts, access control panels, bar code scanners, video cameras, still cameras, and microphones, as taught by Lemons, with the motivation to monitor and control all aspects of an integrated security system (column 2, lines 30-33).

9.   Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Nail (US# 5758340).

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 1, the teachings of Crater in regards to claim 1 have been discussed above. Crater does not disclose that the remote device can be locked, thereby preventing the simultaneous submission of instructions by more than one user.

Nail teaches that the remote device can be locked, thereby preventing the simultaneous submission of instructions by more than one user (column 3, lines 6-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

teachings of Crater with a means to lock a remote device to prevent simultaneous submission of

instructions by more than one user, as taught by Nail, with the motivation to prevent data

inconsistency (column 3, line 6).

10.   Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al.

("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Launey et al. ("Launey," US005086385A).

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 29, the teachings of Crater in regards to

claim 29 have been discussed above. Crater does not disclose that the pre-selected remote device

is a temperature control device, and wherein said graphical user interface is operable to control

said change in temperature of said temperature control device. However, Crater does disclose

monitoring of temperature (column 8, lines 26-31).

Launey teaches that the pre-selected remote device is a temperature control device, and

wherein said graphical user interface is operable to control said change in temperature of said

temperature control device (column 16, lines 48-61). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater with

a means to control the temperature through a user interface, as taught by Launey, with the

motivation to provide a simple interface to control the environment of a building (column 3, lines

10-13).

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jordan S Golinkoff whose telephone number is 703-305-8771.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00

p.m. and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jordan Golinkoff
Patent Examiner
April 29, 2004

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100